



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/615,383	07/13/2000	Marc S. Casalaina	21113-04968	3220

22830 7590 06/07/2005

CARR & FERRELL LLP
2200 GENG ROAD
PALO ALTO, CA 94303

EXAMINER

TRAN, PHILIP B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/615,383

Applicant(s)

CASALAINA, MARC S.

Examiner

Philip B. Tran

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31, 33 and 34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 and 33-34 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

20

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

1. Claims 7, 11-18, 20-21, 24, 26, 27 and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hoffmann (US 6,728,769 B1).

Regarding claims 7-8, Hoffmann teaches a method for transmitting product configuration information generated by a server side of an Internet-based configuration system to user side of the configuration system (Fig. 2), the method comprising

generating a configuration page that allows a user to provide a user input to the configuration system (col. 2 lines 14-20 and col. 5 lines 5-30),

associating delta configuration page information with the configuration page (col. 5 lines 5-62 and col. 8 lines 25-32); and

transmitting the configuration page and the delta configuration page information to the user side from the server side (col. 5 lines 26-27).

Regarding claim 11, Hoffman teaches a control delta that represents changes in a control of the configuration page as a result of the user input (col. 6 line 49-col. 7 line 2).

Regarding claim 12, Hoffman teaches the delta configuration page information embodies preprocessed configuration engine computations that are responsive to the user input (col. 6 lines 60-66).

Regarding claim 13, Hoffmann teaches transmitting a process for updating the configuration page with the delta configuration page information to the user side from the server side (col. 5 lines 62-66).

Claims 14, 16-18, 20 and 21, 24 are rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 7.

Claim 15 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 11.

Claim 26 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 7.

Claim 27 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 11.

Claim 30 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claims 7.

Regarding claim 31, Hoffmann teaches the delta page information is embedded in the received new page (col. 6 line 66-col. 67 line 7).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-6, 19, 22-23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoffmann (US 6,728,769 B1) in view of Banga et al. (Hereafter, Banga), "Optimistic Deltas for WWW Latency Reduction", In Proc. 1997 SENIX Technical Conf., pp. 289-303, Anaheim, CA, January, 1997.

Regarding claim 1, Hoffmann teaches a method for updating a configuration page on a user side of an Internet based configuration system (Fig. 4), the method comprising:

a responsive to the user side receiving a user input that is associated with delta configuration page information available at the user side (i.e., responsive to the receipt of the selection data, col. 6 lines 49-56), retrieving the delta configuration page information, and updating the configuration page based on the delta configuration page information (i.e., modifying the update icon, col. 6 line 66-col. 7 line2).

Hoffmann does not explicitly teach retrieving information without having to contact the server side of the configuration system.

Banga teaches retrieving information without having to contact the server side of the configuration system (i.e., sending delta page for updating the changes from the proxy cache to client without making contact with the content provider) [see Abstract and Pages 295-297].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hoffmann to include retrieving information without having to contact the server side of the configuration system as taught by Banga because it would eliminate the latency for retrieving pages elsewhere in the internet (Banga, section 1, 2nd paragraph).

Regarding claim 2, Hoffman teaches a control delta that represents changes in a control of the configuration page as a result of the user input (col. 6 line 49-col. 7 line 2).

Regarding claim 3, Hoffman teaches the delta configuration page information embodies preprocessed configuration engine computations that are responsive to the user input (col. 6 lines 60-66)

Regarding claim 4, Hoffman teaches layering the delta configuration page information that is associated with the user input into the configuration page via Dynamic html (col. 5 line 31-66)

Regarding claim 5, Hoffmann teaches the updating step is performed by a process that is embedded in the configuration page (col. 5 lines 62-66).

Regarding claim 6, Hoffman teaches the delta page information is embedded in the configuration page (col. 6 line 66-col. 67 line 7).

Claim 19 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 1.

Claims 22-23 are rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 2.

Claim 25 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 2.

Art Unit: 2155

3. Claims 9-10, 28-29 and 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoffmann (US 6,728,769 B1) in view of Joes et al. (Jois) (US 6,112,242).

Regarding claims 9 and 10, Hoffmann does not explicitly teach look-up table as claimed.

Jois teaches organized information within the look-up table pursuant to an indexing scheme, and embedding the look-up table in the configuration page (col. 2 lines 1-4 and col. 5 line 60-col. 6 line 60). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hoffmann to embed the look-up table in the configuration page because it would improve interactive transactions in a hypertext data processing system operating in a Web client-server network (Jois, col. 2 lines 33-36).

Claims 28-29 are rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 10.

Regarding claim 33, Hoffmann does not explicitly teach the delta page information is configured to update a plurality of pages, the new page being included in the plurality of pages. Jois teaches the delta page information is configured to update a plurality of pages, the new page being included in the plurality of pages (abstract, col. 2 lines 8-29 and col. 5 lines 5-34). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hoffmann to include the delta page information is configured to update a plurality of pages, the new page being included in the plurality of pages as taught by Jois because it would improve

interactive transactions in a hypertext data processing system operating in a Web client-server network (Jois, col. 2 lines 33-36).

Regarding claim 34, Hoffman-Jois teaches the user input is used to select the delta page information from a plurality of delta page information available on the client site (Jois, col. 3 lines 6-8).

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip Tran at telephone number is (571) 272-3991.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Philip Tran
May 27, 2005